The Middle East On The U.S. Campus

Naseer H. Aruri

1985

About This Issue

The first Middle East study center in the United States was founded in 1946 at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, DC. Since that time, at least 17 major Middle East Centers have been established, including centers at Princeton, Harvard and Columbia, with more than 115 colleges and universities now offering Middle East area courses.

With growth, however, has come a disturbing awareness.

On November 20, 1984, the Middle East Studies Association, an association of 1,400 members, passed a resolution calling on the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith to disown a list of names which implied that some American academics were "pro-Arab propagandists," who used "their antiZionism as merely a guise for their deeply felt anti-Semitism."

Why did a national association of academics, including scholars of both Jewish and Arab backgrounds, feel obligated to rebuke the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith? The reasons, according to Prof. Naseer Aruri, go well beyond the ADL blacklisting. The ways to violate a teacher's academic freedom are many, subtle and not so subtle; in this issue Aruri describes some of them.

In our Book Views section Donald Neff reviews Error and Betrayal in Lebanon' by George W. Ball and The Armageddon Network by Michael Saba (see page 14). These and other books may be purchased at discount prices through AMEU; see page 15 for details.

Our August-September issue of The Link will focus on the Middle East in the United States courtroom.

John F. Mahoney, Executive Director

Abstract

The American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), generally considered the nerve center of Israel's lobby activity on Capitol Hill, is venturing into other areas of America's politicized community, including its college campuses. In October 1984, AIPAC issued a 187-page college guide monitoring pro- and anti-Israel activities in the United States. [1] The guide reflects AIPAC's and other lobbyists' concern about the growing influence of anti-Israel scholars, students and activists on the American campus.

Current efforts by pro-Israel organizations like AIPAC to stifle campus opposition to Israeli policies is an extension of an ongoing campaign under way since the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. A watershed in the politicization of American Jewry, the war catalyzed a growing commitment among American Jews to identify with Israel. Of great concern was the David image of Israel, which suffered perceptible erosion because of the war. By occupying Arab territories several times its original size, Israel emerged as the military Goliath, with stone-throwing Palestinians the new David.

The armed struggle by the Palestinians drew support from the American left, and the humanitarian dimensions of the movement, magnified as they were by a military occupation, gained backing from the church and peace community. Disturbed by this trend, Israel and its newly mobilized constituency in the United States embarked on a campaign to reverse the drift and to head off public debate on the legitimate rights of the Palestinians.

Particularly disturbing was the role of the universities which, like the churches, afforded a forum for critics and an environment for recruiting support. Pro-Palestinian groups, it was feared, would forge coalitions, broaden the scope of their campaign and appeal to mainstream groups.

The campus revolts of the 1960's and early 1970's opened other avenues by democratizing university governance. Young faculty and students acquired important powers in hiring, firing, curriculum, tenure, promotion and resource allocation. This new dimension paved the way for the introduction of new courses hitherto regarded as not purely academic. The trend toward a less tradition-bound, less rigid and less formalistic education was ideal for

recruiting more activist scholars into the universities, and for the introduction of new courses on the contemporary Middle East. And while activist scholars on both sides of the Middle East conflict entered through that opening, the real threat to the status-quo seemed to come from the pro-Palestinian side with its professors, students, courses and campus activities.

Zionist perceptions of the potential danger of the post-1967 academic shift were further aggravated by a growing receptivity to a revised interdisciplinary Middle East curriculum. Prior to 1967, Middle East studies curricula focused on medieval history, the Ottoman Empire and Islam as rendered by Orientalists, all sufficiently benign as to pose little threat to Israel's supporters. After 1967, however, the Palestine-Israel conflict and its derivative subjects appeared not only in Middle Eastern studies, but in Sociology, Political Science, International Law, Economics and Business.

Of particular concern were the Middle East studies departments and centers founded under the National Defense Act of 1958. Gradually these departments broadened their curricula to include teaching Arabic language and literature and hiring pro-Palestinian lecturers and staff. This, in turn, brought complaints by pro-Israel groups that the departments lacked sufficient courses in Judaic studies and about modern Israel. Increasingly, the Middle East conflict was being fought through the curriculum, in lecture committees and among campus activists. Zionist organizations saw it as a massive, well-coordinated, well-financed campaign by Arab propagandists which had to be met head on.

An early warning by the American Jewish Committee (AJC), later echoed by most major Jewish organizations, spoke of a massive Arab effort to change United States foreign policy in the Middle East. A confidential memorandum, signed on April 2, 1969, by Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, director of AJC's Interreligious Affairs Department, alerted constituents to an Arab propaganda campaign at the United Nations and its agencies, on college campuses, in American churches, and among the country's political leadership.

The memorandum indicated the need to alert the Jewish religious and communal leadership to the rising danger on the regional, state and local levels. Other remedies included the formation of committees "to monitor Christian publications, speakers, programs, etc., that take place in church meetings," and bureaus of "informed Jewish speakers" to speak and respond to the media. Also encouraged was "personal contacts and friendships with Christian clergy . . . [which] may include lunches, pulpit exchange, social visits, private and public meetings." It also urged the use of the pro-Israel American Association of University Professors for Peace in the Middle East, as well as existing national Jewish organizations, such as AIPAC, ADL and

others.

1. Jonathan Kessler and Jeff Schwaber, The AIPAC College Guide Exposing The Anti-Israel Campaign on Campus (Washington: The American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1984).

Premises Of The New Offensive

The Tanenbaum memorandum represented the genesis of a renewed Zionist offensive, founded on the premise that a pervasive campaign was threatening United States' support for Israel, that this campaign reflected anti-Semitic feeling, latent or real, and that the campaign had to be fought through a variety of monitoring and surveillance techniques in order to identify, discredit and ultimately" silence the culprit organizations and individuals.

Beginning in the mid-70's, Zionist organizations started to issue publications on the presence of this threat, offering highly exaggerated information on the campaign staged by ArabAmericans and critics of Israel. Target USA: The Arab Propaganda Offensive, published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL) in 1975, leads off with: "The Arab propaganda offensive in the U.S. has begun … the Arabs are moving. Their basic levers are oil and money." [1] Deliberately exaggerating the "offensive," it states "the apparatus at their disposal is, by any yardstick, massive . . . operating on a budget of approximately $30 million a year," which is "part of a worldwide Arab campaign of economic and political warfare that is aimed at isolating Israel diplomatically and at strangling her economically so that, if successful, her destruction would become inevitable and merely a matter of time." [2]

The ADL tract then went on to note that, along with successes in the American banking, commercial and industrial communities, "there was an Arab presence and a pro-PLO movement on college campuses." The "offensive," it claimed, was "marked by a new sophistication that contrasts sharply" with earlier efforts. The components of this "well-coordinated and financed" operation included "brain trusters," "think tanks," the "Arab lobby," and numerous other arms and pillars such as the Middle East Institute, the Association of Arab-American University Graduates, described as the "PLO's American connection," Americans for Middle East Understanding, Middle East Research and Information Project, and individuals such as Senator Mark Hatfield, M.T. Mehdi, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal and the "Catholic editors."

Under the heading "The campus and the colleges," the Association of Arab-American University Graduates (AAUG) is singled out for its special role:

> Other Arab and Arab-American graduates of United States colleges and universities help form the reservoir of brains and intellect that makes the AAUG such a valuable asset to the Arab-PLO propaganda offensive in this country today.[3]

Arab students on American campuses are also seen as a major threat to the informational and intellectual status-quo regarding the Middle East.

The ADL updated its list with a new directory in 1983 entitled Pro-Arab Propaganda in America: Vehicles and Voices. AIPAC published Who's Who in Arab Propaganda in 1977, retitled The Campaign to Discredit Israel in 1983, listing 21 organizations and 39 individuals, 10 of whom are professors. The American Jewish Committee in 1978 issued "The Arab-Americans and Their Organizations: A Fact Sheet," by Sheba Mittelman, with the warning that the "Jewish community in the United States must reckon with increased competition from ArabAmericans and their friends over the formulation of American policy."[4]

1. "Target USA: The Arab Propaganda Offensive," Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (November 1975), mimeographed, p. 1.

2. Ibid., p. 4.

3. Ibid., p. 106

4. Sheba Mittelman, "The Arab Americans and Their Organizations: A Fact Sheet," the American Jewish Committee (May 15, 1978), mimeographed, p. 16.

The Techniques Of The New Offensive

The techniques to silence criticism of Israeli policies on the campus range from mobilizing students to monitoring campus activities and preventing the recruitment of faculty and administrators who express sympathy for the Palestinian cause. Lobbying for or against academic programs and lecture series, discrediting pro-Palestinian faculty by interfering in their promotion and tenure, manipulating the editorial policy and regulation of campus publications are other techniques currently used by major Jewish organizations, their regional and local constituencies, as well as by smaller groups and individuals.

AIPAC relies heavily on its Political Leadership Development Program to carry out its campus work and to recruit its own staff workers. Through this program, it has organized approximately 350 workshops in all 50 states involving around 5,000 students. At its 24th Annual Policy Conference, held June 14, 1983, young delegates learned about the AIPAC-led defeat of Senator Adlai Stevenson and Representative Paul Findley, both considered sympathetic to Palestinian rights. Participants received instructions in how to: monitor and influence the media at home; lobby Washington from home throughout the year; and acquire proper response to pro-Palestinian events and speakers.

Also during the policy conference, workshops and panels considered such subjects as “Responding to Israel’s Detractors,” “The Campus, the Community and the American Political Process,” “Working with AIPAC on Campus,” “Building Coalitions on Campus,” and “Assessing the Campus.” [1] Panelists and workshop leaders included: Jonathan Kessler, AIPAC’s Leadership Development coordinator; Rabbi Stanley Ringler of B’nai B’rith; Jack Abramov, chairman, College Republican National Committee; Bernard Friedman, former president, College Democrats of America; Bill Morton of the NAACP; and Debbie Mulligan, youth representative of a Christian Ministry among Jewish People.

Also distributed by a Youth Institute For Peace in the Middle East was a

leaflet entitled “Making More Effective Use of the Student Newspaper,” which covered such areas as preparing press releases, familiarizing oneself with decision-making and newspaper policy, getting a columnist position, and how to make Middle East events “relevant” to the campus community. Consider the following counsel:

> Use current events effectively. If the PLO murders a moderate Palestinian, make that the basis for an editorial on PLO “moderation.” The Iran-Iraq conflict was a perfect opportunity for refuting the claim that the Palestinian issue is the key to Mideast peace. [2]

Or the following strategem:

> Keep the focus of the debate in mind. For example, if a letter insists on stating the “Palestinian-Israeli problem,” refocus the debate in your piece in terms of “the Arab refugee problem” or the “Arab-Israeli problem.” Don’t remain on the defensive . . . [also] use the “rhetoric sandwich” technique. That is, open a letter to the editor with a reference to a current event. In the body of the letter, stress how this event merely serves to point out that … [rhetorical point] and finish with one sentence touching the current event again … use them [these techniques] and put the percentages on your side. [3]

Conferees were also supplied with updated themes. AIPAC, for example, planned to emphasize that minorities are ill-treated in the Arab world and that blacks in America, with their own crowded agenda, have nothing to gain by expending efforts for the Palestinian cause. Conference members were also told that the biggest public relations reversal for Israel in 1982 was the loss of its favorable David image against the combined Arab Goliath, and that the Palestinians now hold the underdog or David position. Direct blame for that was placed on the “pro-Arab lobby.”

AIPAC’s strategy became the subject of a special feature in the December 1983 issue of The Middle East:

> AIPAC puts a lot of effort into monitoring anti-Israel speakers. Tapes and notes are collected and files compiled. When AIPAC is informed that one of these speakers is scheduled to address a particular college, summaries of his usual points and arguments, a description of his question-and-answer style and a list of potentially damaging quotations from earlier talks is sent to activists in advance. AIPAC also draws up questions which speakers will have difficulty with and helps to plan strategies suited to each campus. [4]

The article further noted AIPAC’s tendency to: pack meetings with pro-Israel

students; arrange a competing meeting; “leaflet” the event, using the event to promote a pro-Israel activity on campus; build up political support within the campus community to have events blocked, or sponsorship challenged or withdrawn. The author concluded his discussion of AIPAC’s campus strategy by noting: “Otherwise, disruptive protests can be organized which will discourage the college administration from arranging future pro-Palestinian speakers.”

1. “Political Action From The College Campus: AIPAC Policy Conference,” Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., June 12-14, 1983.

2. “Making More Effective Use of the Student Newspaper,” pamphlet prepared by the Youth Institute for Peace in the Middle East and distributed at AIPAC convention.

3. Ibid.

4. “Secret Strategy of the Israeli Lobby,” The Middle East (London), December 1983, p. 29.

Surveillance, Monitoring And Intelligence Gathering

The leading organizations which engage in surveillance of campus activities are AIPAC and the ADL. Both groups publish campus directories and general directories which include data on academics and universities.

As part of its "counter-effort," AIPAC published in October 1984 The AIPAC College Guide, a survey of political activity on campuses across the nation. Based on questionnaires completed by some 200 students, this 12-page survey includes general questions about the mood on campus, active student groups, the reputation of the student government and student newspaper, coverage and editorial policy of the college newspaper on the Middle East, whether a Jewish newspaper is published on campus, and available Jewish fraternities, sororities and organizations.

More specific questions deal with obtaining political intelligence. A subsection, entitled "The Arab-Israel Battle on Campus," begins with, "Why have the Arabs taken the battle to college campuses?" More detailed questions follow: "Which of the following groups have chapters on campus? Rate their recent level of activity on a scale of 1 to 5"; "What are the major propaganda themes of these anti-Israel groups?"; "Do anti-Israel groups work well together? If not, why?"

Question 27, perhaps the most interesting of all, reads: "Please name any individual faculty who assist anti-Israel groups. How is this assistance offered? (If there is a Middle East Study Center, please elaborate on its impact on campus.)"

The value of this extensive datagathering was spelled out in the AIPAC cover letter of June 22, 1983, which solicited help for the survey. The Guide, it said, "will provide national and local Jewish leaders, parents of college-bound students and pro-Israel student activists with an in-depth analysis of pro- and anti-Israel activity on the campus." And, indeed, sixteen months later, AIPAC was distributing the report to "thousands of college students." [1]

The report also makes some hurried remarks about the extent of anti-Israel activity on some 100 campuses across the nation. For example: the University of Massachusetts at Amherst has "traditionally hosted one of the nation's most active campaigns to discredit Israel. There has been enough anti-Israel activity at U Mass — a campus which has 90 foreign Arab students in 1982-83 — to force the pro-Israel community to concentrate much of its energy on propaganda response." While the report levels no accusations against the faculty and administration of the Amherst campus, it takes to task Wesleyan University in Connecticut where "anti-Israel activity" allegedly extends to the faculty and some students. It characterizes the Palestinian Forum at Wesleyan, sometimes called "Wesleyan Friends of the Palestinians," as "an organization which has yet to establish any real credibility on campus."

Rutgers University and the State University of New York at Buffalo are depicted in the report as centers where a solidly organized campaign to discredit Israel has gone relatively unchallenged. Indeed, Rutgers is said to have "one of the nation's fiercest anti-Israel campus campaigns." San Jose State University and the University of Southern California also present a hostile attitude toward Israel. More benign colleges include: Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, Boston University, Wellesley College and the University of Vermont.

The second organization which surveys campus activities is the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. In November 1983, its New England regional office directed a letter to campus Jewish leaders announcing a "special program to help Jewish student leaders combat anti-Semitism and anti-Israel propaganda and create positive images of Jews and Israel."

Two or three students, designated by campus leaders as "ADL liaisons," would monitor campus activities. An enclosed booklet provided confidential "background information on pro-Arab sympathizers who are active on college campuses." The reader is advised that the booklet should be considered confidential: "Although most of the information contained in it is derived from public sources, it easily could be misconstrued. Please use your discretion."

The booklet is in two sections: (1) organizations in Northern California and New England, and (2) individuals. Among organizations listed is the Institute of Arab Studies (IAS) in Belmont, MA, which came under attack by the Boston Phoenix, a newspaper which often espouses pro-Israel policies, and which ultimately led to the firing of columnist Alexander Cockburn by the Village Voice on the pretext that he had accepted a research grant from the IAS. [2]

The November 1983 letter also asked that "knowledge of any individuals or groups not listed in the booklet" be passed on so that "we can have a more complete and useful listing."

A pamphlet of the Jewish Student's Union of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at Toronto University conveys an even greater sense of urgency:

> If you see posters, publications or activists from these anti-Israel and anti-Jewish organizations on campus, report it immediately to the Jewish Student's Union … [address, directions, telephone]

Included are associations of Muslim students, non-Zionist Jews, Arab-Canadians, Marxists, Trotskyists, Palestinians, even Moonies and Hare Krishnas. Also targeted for surveillance is Toronto University's Middle East Group, which represents faculty members with interest in the Middle East.

At its annual convention at Berkeley, CA, in November 1984, the Middle East Studies Association of North America [MESA] deplored and condemned this surveillance and "black listing." MESA's resolution called on AIPAC and the ADL to "disavow and refrain from such activities," such as AIPAC's soliciting "unbalanced information on students, faculty and other parties at American university campuses through a 'Survey of Political Activism,'" and ADL's "listing factually inaccurate and unsubstantiated assertions that defame specific students, teachers and researchers as 'pro-Arab propagandists,' who 'use their anti-Zionism as merely a guise for their deeply felt anti-Semitism.'" The resolution implied strongly that these activities constitute a threat to academic freedom, open investigation and reasoned debate, which are essential to scholarly activity. It characterized these activities as involving "false, vague, or unsubstantiated accusations which amount to no more than drawing conclusions based on the circumstantial evidence of religion, race, ethnicity, association …" It also condemned "the creation, storage, or dissemination of blacklists, 'enemy lists,' or surveys which call for boycotting individuals, academic classes, harassment, or ostracism which might create an atmosphere of intimidation or prevent scholars from carrying out their teaching, research or administrative duties."

Actual harassment and attempted cancellation of public lectures on the basis of information provided in the blacklists impelled some faculty members to lodge complaints with MESA's Ethics Committee. While neither [ADL or AIPAC] report advocates the restriction of freedom of expression for those individuals or organizations listed, the reports are being used to restrict freedom of expression and to delegitimize possible criticism of Israel's actions. This author personally encountered two situations in the fall of 1984: the first when an individual supplied a newspaper with information from the

ADL's Pro-Arab Propaganda in America: Vehicles and Voices to cast aspersion on a presentation I had made and which he did not attend; the second when a Jewish group unsuccessfully tried to cancel a lecture on human rights in the Middle East, scheduled to be given in Tennessee. The representation made to the sponsors was based on an entry about me in the ADL report.

The accuracy of the information contained in these lists is questionable, and there is striking similarity between the profiles listed in ADL's Vehicles and Voices and in AIPAC's Campaign to Discredit Israel, suggesting the existence of a central file on critics of Israel's policies. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has been known for some time to maintain such a file.

Noam Chomsky, a linguistics and philosophy professor at M.I.T. and a well-known peace movement and human rights activist, obtained a 150 page ADL file on his activities. The file shows that his talks are systematically monitored, sent to individuals and groups where he speaks, and presumably used as the basis for the unsigned defamation pamphlets that regularly appear or for tirades from the floor.

In a written affidavit, Professor Chomsky states that the reports are written by individuals who heard his talks, or, in one case, by a group called "Operation Jupiter." Materials in his file also indicate that there are files on other individuals named in his affidavit.

Of particular interest is one entry of alleged claims that he has made (under the heading "myths") and responses (under the label "facts"). Chomsky's affidavit states:

> I know that this pamphlet is distributed nationwide . . . often the same material is distributed in various parts of the country, indicating some central source. On occasion, people distributing the material have indicated that the source is the ADL … I also have reason to believe that material from the ADL file is sent to individuals who are to appear in debates with me, in particular, Prof. Alan Dershowitz of Harvard University Law School. My presumption, then, is that the ADL files constitute a central source for a coordinated effort to discredit or counter the activities of people regarded by the ADL as critics of Israel.

Chomsky's affidavit also raises an important question about the legality of surveillance by the ADL, under its grant of tax-exemption as a religious and educational institution; he writes:

> I do not feel that I should be compelled, through the tax-exemption granted to the ADL, to fund the surveillance of my talks and actions … if some private group chooses to engage in such activities, that is their

business. But I do not want to pay for it.

1. David Farrell, “College’s Anti-Israel Climate Rated,” Boston Globe, October 24, 1984.

2. See: Boston Phoenix, January 3, 21, 29, 31, 1984, February 7, 15-21, 1984, April 24, 1984; editorial in Wall Street Journal, January 13, 1984; The Nation, February 18, 1984; Alexander Cockburn, “At Last My Day In Court,” Village Voice, January 24, 1984. See statement by Institute of Arab Studies on “Newspaper Articles on Cockburn Fellowship,” January 16, 1984.

Censorship, Liberal Style

The published guides and who's who lists, as well as the surveillance of activists, have had a chilling effect on free speech, the right to free inquiry and dissent. A number of professors have discovered the limits of academic freedom when placed on the defensive by charges of anti-Semitism. Often leveled rather callously the charges tend to be taken seriously by many administrators and faculty committees. In this atmosphere college decision-makers sometimes feel intimidated, while others try to police themselves to avoid the eruption of a controversial situation; hence they refrain from actions that may rock the boat and upset the delicate Middle East equation.

In the following cases, charges were brought by organized groups or by individuals; others exemplify some kind of internal policing.

Professor Chomsky and the University of Michigan. Noam Chomsky was scheduled to lecture at the University of Michigan on October 19, 1984, under the aegis of its Center for Near Eastern and North African Studies. The center, however, withdrew the invitation, apparently because its director, Prof. Ernest McCarus, who had extended the invitation in July, had not shared his decision with his colleagues. In a three-to-two vote his associates revoked the invitation, citing the center's policy of sponsoring only "genuine" scholars in the field. [1] According to an article by Michigan Prof. Alan Wald, who tried unsuccessfully to have the history and political science departments sponsor Chomsky's lecture on the Middle East, it was History Professor Feuerwerker who reiterated the charge that Chomsky lacked "professional credentials" for the topic and that the talk would not be "an entirely academic presentation." [2]

These charges are truly astounding given Chomsky's well-established reputation in the areas of American foreign policy and the Middle East, not to mention his world-renowned expertise in his own field of linguistics. Although not a student of Medieval Islam or the Ottoman period, nor a scholar in its narrowest sense, Chomsky has written extensively on the global role of the United States, its involvement in Vietnam and its policy in the Middle East. He has authored no less than eight books and dozens of articles on these subjects.

Professor Wald, and many others at the University of Michigan, believe the real issue in Chomsky's case was political, a matter of censorship, and that Chomsky's support of the right of Palestinians to have a home of their own alongside Israel was the real reason for the cancellation:

> I think that, for the most part, the members of the executive committee let themselves be persuaded of Chomsky's "incompetence" on such ludicrous grounds because they wanted an out; they felt it would be easier to do this than to face up to any complaints that might arise against the center for sponsoring Chomsky. [3]

Wald observed that Chomsky's experience illustrates that repression of dissent is occurring in new forms in the 1980's:

> The threat is not just from government intervention in universities, as it was in the 1950's . . . more and more frequently these days, the suppression of dissent comes from the inside, from faculty members quite willing to "police themselves." And increasingly, one finds that "scholarly incompetence" as the excuse for the act, accompanied by all sorts of professions of nonpartisanship, objectivity, and respect for "academic freedom." But every now and then, as in the present case, someone forgets to pull the shade all the way down and one catches a glimpse of the knifing of the victim by "honorable men . . ."[4]

Chomsky spoke at the University of Michigan, not within the original sponsorship, but under the aegis of a group of campus organizations.

Quite recently another Chomsky lecture was cancelled. The lecture, scheduled in June 1984, was to be held at the Cleveland City Club, on March 15, 1985. A letter written by Jeremy Genovese, lecture organizer, states that the club had withdrawn its offer of facilities at the end of January 1985:

> The Cleveland City Club has decided to book someone other than Professor Chomsky on March 15, 1985. I am not sure what caused them to change their mind; they were initially very positive about the possibility of having Professor Chomsky speak.

Prof. Ernest Dube. During the fall semester of 1983, Ernest Dube, a black South African professor in the African Studies Program at the State University of New York (SUNY) at Stony Brook endured threats on his life, denunciation by New York Gov. Mario Cuomo, and saw his tenure held in abeyance for one year. A former prisoner for four years in South Africa for opposition to the apartheid regime, Dube holds a doctorate in psychology, yet he was declared by some pro-Israel colleagues unqualified to conduct a course on "The Politics of Race."

On July 15, 1983, a visiting professor from Israel, Selwyn Troen, wrote a complaint, shortly before returning to Israel, to Dean Egon Neuberger accusing Dube of "racist bias" and "anti-Semitism." [5] Dube, a member of the African National Congress, which consists of all racial groups in South Africa, responded:

> I wish he was man enough to confront me directly before writing this letter . . . I still think this is nonsense. However, after reading it carefully, I found that it was more than nonsense; the letter is abusive, derogatory, arrogant, and full of half-truths and outright untruths. Its purpose makes me shudder, not so much because it misrepresents me, but because its intention is to dictate what must be taught; how, if ever it is taught, it should be taught, and by whom it must be taught.

Troen returned to Israel without ever talking with Dube or hearing him lecture. His complaint, based upon a conversation with one of Dube's students and a copy of his course syllabus, was picked up by a group of faculty and administrators and, soon after, the dean was visited by a representative from the Long Island regional office of the ADL and also interviewed by a Long Island Newsday reporter.

As pressure mounted, the university executive committee reviewed the case to determine whether Professor Dube had been irresponsible when he lectured on Zionism as a form of racism. The committee found the evidence "skimpy" and decided on August 17, 1983, that "the bounds of academic freedom had not been crossed." Prof. Joel Rosenthal, the committee chairman, said: "this means, that in our eyes, the allegations did not have merit."

But external pressure began to mount again. The New York Times, on October 11, 1983, reported that one day after the executive committee decision, Rabbi Seltzer of the Anti-Defamation League met with an aide to the governor, and two weeks later Governor Cuomo issued a press release which characterized Dube's teaching as "intellectually dishonest and pernicious," and as providing "a justification for genocide in the form of … the annihilation of the state of Israel." In addition, the press release chastised the Stony Brook faculty for its "thunderous" silence. Professor Rosenthal responded:

> I felt the governor's statement was very unfortunate and very unnecessary . . I think he did it to help himself politically. [6]

More political interference came from an Albany legislator who, according to Prof. Leslie Owens, head of African Studies at Stony Brook, "threatened to

hold up the budget of SUNY [the entire New York state college system] unless Professor Dube is fired and the course is stricken from the books." [7]

Dube's course, "the Politics of Race," focuses on "the three forms of racism and how they manifested themselves: Nazism in Germany; Apartheid in South Africa; and Zionism in Israel." He is still teaching the course, but has dropped the unit linking Zionism with racism, which constituted one-half a lecture in a semester of about twenty-four lectures. On the other hand, the university continues to offer a full-semester course, "Zionism from 1848 to 1948," described by its professor as "a good, solid objective view of Zionism as a movement for national liberation." [8]

The Dube case was seen as a failure of the American Jewish community to make effective use of extensive academic resources at its disposal. Prof. Lawrence Schiffman, in New York University's Near Eastern Languages and Literature Department, wrote an article in which he criticized the Jewish community organizations, which attempted to "clip the wings" of Dube, for having "aroused the ire of the faculty."[9] According to Prof. Monroe Freedman of Hofstra University, the Jewish community should have questioned Dube's "competence" in Middle East affairs. Freedman stated that Dube, a psychologist, "who has never been to Israel . . . is about as qualified to teach about Zionism or Israel as I am to teach nuclear physics." [10] For Schiffman it was one of the more blatant examples of the "mishandling of an issue by the Jewish community in which academics could have helped":

> Any academic, if asked, would have cautioned against raising the spectre of censorship. Instead, we would have attacked the man's credentials. He could easily have been stopped from giving that course, and perhaps, if we were skillful enough about it, from receiving tenure. [11]

Still, the quotation begs the question: Isn't this a form of censorship regardless of the strategy or the packaging?

Prof. Edward Keenan. Edward Keenan, professor of linguistics at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), is "the number one target of 'operation clean up,'" according to the Jewish Defense Organization's militant leader, Mordechai Levy, who vowed to teach Keenana lesson on "Jewish Justice" if he remained much longer at UCLA. [12] Keenan, a former professor at Tel Aviv University in Israel, was accused by both militant and mainstream Jewish campus organizations of being anti-Zionist and a supporter of UCLA's Committee for the Survival of the Palestinian People (CSPP).

Rabbi Chaim Seidler-Feller, director of the Hillel Jewish Student Center at

UCLA, described CSPP's anti-Zionism as a "form of discrimination bordering on racism." [13] Ha'am, UCLA's Jewish news magazine, in May 1984 published an article by Karen Hirsch, who accused Keenan of inflicting his personal views upon the students, instead of serving them, as a good teacher should, with his knowledge and scientific experience. [14]

Keenan challenged Hirsch to "document a single incident" in which he pressed his political views in class, and rejected the notion that academics should not express political and social concerns, asking rhetorically: "Have we so soon forgotten the silence of German academics during the Holocaust period?"[15] He rejected the notion that critics of Israel are anti-Semites and defended his opposition to Israel's invasion of Lebanon and annexationist policies in the West Bank. In regard to his demonstration in front of the Israeli consulate, which angered Jewish groups on the campus, Keenan said:

> When I demonstrated against the Honduran consulate or the South African consulate or against the iVarcos visit, no one accused me of racism. What makes the Israeli consulate so special? [16]

The Academic Freedom Committee of UCLA's faculty senate unanimously upheld on April 17 Keenan's right to teach. Having reviewed a flier concerning Keenan, allegedly distributed by the JDO, the committee "deplored any threat or implied threat of violence against any member of our faculty." [17] The committee also disagreed with the underlined statement in the flier that an anti-Semite has no right to teach:

> To fire professors on the basis of their beliefs or associations, even if the allegations were true, would abridge their academic freedom… [18]

Responding to the charge that Keenan was affiliated with UCLA's Committee for the Survival of the Palestinian People, the committee asserted:

> Organizational affiliation is irrelevant unless such organizational affiliation is used to abridge the rights of academic freedom of other members of the university community. [19]

UCLA's student newspaper, Daily Bruin, accused the JDO of "employing strong-arm tactics" in demanding Keenan's expulsion, and using a "narrow minded approach to the very complex situation in the Middle East." [20] The editorial added:

> Being pro-Palestinian does not automatically indicate an anti-Semitic sentiment . . . there is more than just one side to every issue, and the JDO should allow the dissenting view to be aired. [21]

Keenan's vindication by the faculty committee seems to have disappointed Rabbi Seidler-Feller of Hillel, who criticized Mordechai Levy of the JDO by saying that he "is causing more trouble for the Jews than he could have ever imagined, because he has forced the UCLA faculty to defend Keenan. Had things been allowed to take their course or been handled differently, we would have witnessed a different outcome." [22] Like the Dube case, the Keenan incident was seen as a mishandled matter. Keenan expressed his own dismay when he said:

> Young Jews at UCLA will look at Chaim [Rabbi Chaim SeidlerFeller] as a leader, will infer from his remarks that the faculty should not have defended me, that I was doing something wrong. They will obviously regard me with suspicion and dislike, if not outright hatred. Abetting these charges in this way was, in my judgment, a meretricious and unworthy act. [23]

Prof. Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban. Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, professor of anthropology at Rhode Island College in Providence, discovered that an article she had written in the mid-70's about Arab women became an issue when she applied for an academic-administrative position. Selected for "further consideration" among 137 candidates by the search committee for the position of Associate VicePresident for Human Resources at the University of Vermont in May 1984, she was invited for an intensive two-day interview on September 17 and 18. Professor Fluehr-Lobban noticed that certain questions were raised during the interview: first, whether she has ever had difficulty from students questioning her work in the Middle East, to which she replied that, in fact, students seemed to be quite interested to learn more about this important region of the world. Second, she was told by a search committee member that "rumors" of her anti-Semitism were circulating on campus and was asked how she would respond to such questions. Fluehr-Lobban offered an anthropological explanation of Semitic people, discussed her work with African Muslim people in Egypt and the Sudan, and her longstanding commitment to the eradication of all forms of racism. (She is a founder of the Women's Rights Committee, the Women's Studies Program, the Committee to Increase Minority Enrollment, a member of the Affirmative Action Committee at her college, and a member of the editorial board of the New England Journal of Black Studies, president of the Sudan Studies Association and an instructor at a Providence education opportunities center primarily for minority and lower income persons.)

After returning from the interview, Fluehr-Lobban wrote on September 17 to the search committee chairperson expressing concern about those rumors and offering to respond to any questions relating to her "personal and professional commitment to a non-racialist view of human society." [24] On

November 13, the chairperson informed Fluehr-Lobban that she was not one of the two candidates recommended to the president for the position, and offered to assist with any questions. [25] Fluehr-Lobban, on November 19, requested a copy of the letter which, she had been informally told, was sent to the search committee alleging anti-Semitism on her part. On November 27, Professor Fluehr-Lobban received a letter from the author, Dr. Stephen Pastner, who enclosed two memoranda which he had sent to the search committee, the president and other university officials.

The first memorandum written by Pastner, then acting chairman of the anthropology department, on September 11, one week before the interview, accused Fluehr-Lobban of anti-Semitism. The author denied "emphatically" that he was "attempting to abridge Fluehr-Lobban's exercise of academic freedom to publish or say what she believes," but he was troubled by an article which she had written. He enclosed a page from her article, "The Political Mobilization of Women in the Arab World," which appears in Women In Contemporary Muslim Societies, published by Associated University Presses in 1980. Two passages in particular were emphasized:

> As the fate of Palestine was sealed and the Palestinian nation was transformed into a settler colonial state under Zionist leadership in Israel, the resistance of the Palestinian people, including Palestinian women, grew.

The second "troublesome" passage reads:

> During twenty-seven years of Zionist occupation, a number of Palestinian liberation movements emerged, and with them the role of women took on even more significant proportions particularly after the 1967 war.

The enclosed passages were described in the September 11 memorandum as being "of such a level of simplistic anti-Israel vehemence that it is close enough to outright antiSemitism as to be indistinguishable from it for practical purposes." Anticipating Fluehr-Lobban's rebuttal, Pastner seemed to delegitimize it in advance:

> I am well aware that those who currently take her rhetorical line, which is evidently quite fashionable in certain quarters (as in the case of a recent ex-candidate for high national office), will hotly deny such a charge. I simply don't buy such disavowals for reasons I am prepared to argue forcefully in any and all fora.

The second memorandum, also written by Pastner on September 18, when Fluehr-Lobban was being interviewed, states that while the author interviewed Fluehr-Lobban and found her "extremely bright, dynamic and

personable," he could not defuse his earlier misgivings about her suitability, and that he was formulating a judgment and soliciting additional material.

It should be pointed out that Professor Fluehr-Lobban's itinerary included an interview with the university president, but he was away from campus and couldn't meet with her. She was assured, however, that arrangements would be made for a personal interview or telephone conversation. Since that did not happen, several questions remain: Was damage to Fluehr-Lobban's candidacy already done in the immediate pre-interview period or during the interview? Or did the university simply fill the position with a more qualified person?

The available evidence suggests that Professor Fluehr-Lobban's written work, which legitimized the Palestinian struggle, was elevated to a significant issue in the recruitment process.

Wayne County Community College vs. the ADL. The Michigan Regional office of the Anti-Defamation League, in its Fall 1977 issue of Update, charged that Wayne County Community College (WC3) "appears to be emerging as a major source of Arab anti-Israel propaganda, Arab organizing, and anti-Jewish activities." [26] This, apparently, was in reference to picketing by Arab-American members of the United Auto Workers during a banquet when the ADL presented a humanitarian award to Leonard Woodcock, then UAW's president. The article accuses a college staff member, who was also a community organizer in the Dearborn ArabAmerican community, of organizing the picketing and using college facilities in other political activities:

> Subsequently, he appears to have organized "PLO Day" rallies, and that the anti-Israel and anti-Semitic leaflets distributed were printed by WC3's [the college's] Community Service Division. [27]

The article also alleged that speakers at an "Arab Day" at the college spoke about "how many senators the Jews 'own,' and called for the dismantling of the Zionist hold over the United States."

The conflict between the ADL and the college escalated in the spring of 1978 when the college president alerted members of the Detroit Jewish and black communities to the ADL charges, and the ADL refused to allow a response by the president to appear in Update, on the grounds that Update was not a public document.

The publication's Winter 1978 issue introduced new charges and complaints against the college and its president, Reginald Wilson, accusing him of being pro-Arab and anti-Israel. [28] Digging into the past, the article referred to a

November 1970 New York Times statement "which he [the president] signed, and which headlined 'An Appeal By Black Americans Against U.S. Support of the Zionist Government of Israel.'" The article went on to say that "confirmed reports of growing anti-Semitism to the college continue to come to the ADL," and that such references "are either inspired or condoned by individuals who are in the administration."

On April 13, 1978, the ADL sent a formal complaint to the president against a VISTA staff worker who allegedly organized the picket and used the college printing facilities to produce the "anti-Semitic" leaflets. The college president referred it to the college's director of community services, who denied all accusations in a letter dated June 14, 1978, and challenged the ADL to produce "any specific evidence or information of any improprieties." Additionally, the assistant dean of community services, in a June 15, 1978 memorandum to President Wilson, described the ADL accusations as "false and distortive." It states:

> We did allow community groups to use our stencil cutter and mimeograph machine-black, Indian, Latino and Arab. ACCESS [Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services] used the mimeograph machine twice to print their newsletter. It was in Arabic. On one occasion [an ADL official] came in and hit the roof and did accuse us of allowing antiSemitic literature to be run off. I kept a copy of the sheets and asked someone to verify if they were newsletters about ACCESS activities. That was confirmed. To my knowledge [the ADL official] does not read Arabic, and did not have a copy of the newsletter, so he would have some difficulty proving his assumptions.

The memorandum further implied that the ADL accusation demonstrated an anti-Arab bias.

> To my knowledge, none of the incidents connected in the one paragraph were related in any way except that persons of Arabic descent were involved. To my way of believing, that's no crime. [Emphasis added]

The college president sent the two memoranda to the chairman of the ADL Michigan regional office on June 20, 1978, in an attempt to put their accusations to rest, as "further proof of the falsity of the totally unfounded charges and accusations leveled at me and at Wayne Community College." Letters from Detroit's black community representatives were also sent to the ADL expressing solidarity with President Wilson.

Other Censorship. A sample of other cases involving mainly the activities of student organizations shows that university administrators, under pressure

from the community, pro-Israel faculty, alumni or organizations, resort to various forms of censorship, including cancellation of scheduled events, dismantling of exhibits, interference in the editorial policy of campus publications, and other attempts to restrict what otherwise is considered ordinary campus activities.

At Georgetown University, the president cancelled a function for the Organization of Arab Students in February 1982, after an alumna brought a flier to his office. [29] A Georgetown spokesman said that the flier was billed as an anniversary celebration of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, promising speeches, songs, entertainment and film. The university president questioned the function's "appropriateness":

> It does not seem to me appropriate for this university to sponsor, even by the use of its facilities, any organization which supports international terrorism. [30]

The president of the Organization of Arab Students denied the Georgetown president's charge that the event was "a celebration of terrorism," adding: "We do not have an independence day to celebrate-so we celebrate the founding of the Democratic Front." [31]

Supporting the Arab students, the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee issued a statement on February 26, 1982, saying that "the issue is not one of terrorism. The issue is the right of students — however unpopular their views — to freely assemble on campus to discuss, present or support these views." [32] It accused Georgetown of anti-Arab bias and applying a double standard:

> If Georgetown is to use such arbitrary judgments as to which events can or cannot be held-what of the right of Salvadorans, Irish, or even those who support Israel (since one could certainly argue that Israeli policies constitute the most brutal forms of terrorism)? [33]

At Rutgers University, an Arab student organization display of Palestinian artwork and photographs of the Sabra and Shatila massacre was dismantled in November 1982 after protests by the Hillel Foundation and Rutger's Association of Zionism and Israel that the display was political, rather than artistic or cultural. [34] According to Rutger's Daily Targum, December 7, 1982, the director of the Hillel Foundation, Rabbi Norman Weitzmer, stated that: "The exhibit showed no Arab poetry or art … there is a lot of beauty in Arab culture." Weitzmer, who did not see the exhibit but was told it contained photographs of dead people, said: "I don't know what culture is in that."

In response, Janet Jones, a Peace Center member, said: “What is shown is culture being destroyed.” Two professors, Eric Davis and Sherry Gorelick, called the ban “censorship.” [35] Davis questioned whether the borderline between political and artistic is clear enough to have meaningful guidelines, and Professor Gorelick compared the display to Picasso’s Guernica, noting that the brutal yet beautiful painting of a bombed-out Spanish town was displayed in the New York City Museum of Modern Art, despite its political statement against the bombing.

A similar exhibit of Southeastern Massachusetts University’s Student Progressive Alliance (SPA), titled “The Human Impact of the Israeli Invasion of Lebanon,” was removed from the library prematurely after complaints from the Lebanese Student Association (LSA), and later by some faculty and members of the community. The LSA president told the student newspaper Torch:

> If there is a display on Lebanon, we have to know as we represent the government of Lebanon. We are the legitimate organization . . . we were afraid that the Lebanese position would be misinterpreted. They [SPA] cannot attack the American Government in Lebanon’s name . . . we do not need leftists or Palestinians to defend ourselves; we have the United States and want to work together. [36]

On the other hand, Mary Beth Verani of SPA, who was initially promised a two-week display, charged the library with applying censorship. In a letter to the Torch she wrote:

> An exhibit on Israel last year was blatantly pro-Israel. A past exhibit showing the victims of war in Cambodia was anti-Vietnam. Even the display which replaces ours … [on] International Women’s Day had an ideological slant; most assuredly feminist. It is clearly hypocritical for the library to apply its rules on “impartiality” to this exhibit and not to all the other exhibits. [37]

Some faculty members saw the library decision as an attempt to “reconcile the liberties of opposing groups … the LSA and SPA,” and accused SPA of having launched an “antiSemitic propaganda war.” Others, including myself, who were also objects of similar accusations, felt that freedom of expression, as it relates to appropriate use of library exhibit space, was the issue in that controversy. [38]

Southeastern Massachusetts University (SMU) was the arena for another interesting, if not unusual, controversy involving the appropriateness of speech and expression. During the summer of 1975, the Torch reprinted an

article by Hebrew University Prof. Israel Shahak, entitled “What Is My Opinion?”[39] The article, which focused on Israeli mistreatment of Palestinian civilians under Israeli occupation, evoked several responses from pro-Israel faculty, local Jewish organizations, and one member of the board of trustees.

The trustee’s letter to the editor of the Torch and the latter’s response soon became more controversial than Shahak’s article. In questioning the appropriateness of the article for a college newspaper, the trustee described it as “hysterical anti-Semitism,” [40] and challenged the credibility of Israel Shahak. [Shahak is wellknown in the human rights community as chairperson of Israel’s League for Human Rights, a survivor of a Nazi concentration camp, and one who has testified many times before United States Congressional committees and international tribunals.] The trustee also cast doubt on the motivation of the Torch editors in publishing the article, claiming the writer to be “an unknown,” the subject “not one which has engaged exceptional student interest at SMU or on most other campuses,” and the article itself to be “poorly researched, inadequately documented, and full of unsupported allegations.” The trustee counseled the editors to exercise their free speech with judgment and “to consider seriously the power and responsibility of a free press.”

It was to this last statement that a former editor of the Torch directed his response:

> Aside from sounding like a direct order, this statement just barely stops short of threatening overt censorship . . . just as Zionism has a right to exist so, too, does criticism of it have a concomitant right to be made. [41]

Noting that a college campus is a most appropriate forum for debate and inquiry, the Torch editor challenged both the allegation about the esoteric nature of the subject and the claim that it did not interest students:

> Throughout the Johnson and Nixon administrations to the present time, the entire Israeli/Arab confrontation complete with all its internal ramifications, which are complex and controversial, has been of extreme concern to all those desiring world peace. I certainly contend that many of these bright and sincere individuals inhabit our campuses, and are here at SMU. [42]

Implying intimidation and challenging the trustee’s criterion of appropriateness, the editor concluded his letter this way:

> Why did you send copies of your letter directly to all members of the board of trustees and to the president of this university without first investigating the matter “rationally?” What about the “appropriateness”

of the very serious implications suggested by your actions? Can your motivation be questioned? And who is really shouting “fire”?

I know you to be a reasonable and just man, but [we] will not be intimidated as long as we remain open to opinion and true to our consciences.

1. See: Ann Arbor News, October 14, 1984; Alan Wald, “Censorship, Liberal Style,” The Michigan Voice, October 1984.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Michael Winerip, “Academic Freedom Tenet Is Tested,” New York Times, October 11, 1983.

6. Ibid.

7. Joyce Chediac, “African Professor Attacked,” Palestine Focus, March 1984, p. 2.

8. Winerip, op. cit.

9. Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Use Our Academics,” Washington Jewish Week, July 12, 1984, p. 16.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.

12. UCLA Daily Bruin, April 13, 1984.

13. Karen Hirsch, “UCLA Prof’s Views Attacked By JDO,” Ha’am, May 1984.

14. Ibid.

15. Edward L. Keenan, “Malicious Charges,” Daily Bruin, May 29, 1984.

16. Ibid.

17. Memorandum from Laura Means Pope, Academic Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, April 23, 1984.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

20. “A Condemnation of Terror” (editorial), Daily Bruin, April 16, 1984.

21. Ibid.

22. Hirsch, op. cit.

23. Keenan, op. cit.

24. Letter from Dr. Carolyn FluehrLobban to Dr. Kenneth N. Fishell, September 27, 1984.

25. Letter from Fishell to Fluehr-Lobban, November 13, 1984.

26. Michigan ADL Update, vol. 5, no. 1 (Fall 1977).

27. Ibid.

28. Update, vol. 5, no. 2 (Winter 1978).

29. Washington Post, February 25, 1982.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. “ADC Supports Arab Students At Georgetown,” press release, February 26, 1982.

33. Ibid.

34. Susan Todd, “Official Calls RU Decision To Ban Arab Exhibit An Error,” The Daily Targum, December 7, 1982.

35. Ibid.

36. Torch, March 25, 1983.

37. Ibid.

38. Torch, April 15 and 22, 1983.

39. Torch, July 7, 14, 28, 1975.

40. Torch, September 5, 1975.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid.

Middle East Centers

Near Eastern Center, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ

Center for Middle Eastern Studies, University of California, Berkeley, CA

G.E. Von Grunebaum Center for Near East Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, CA

Center for Middle East Studies, The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

Middle East Institute, Columbia University, New York, NY

Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Near Eastern Studies Program, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

Center for Near Eastern and North African Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Joint Center for Middle Eastern Studies, New York University/Princeton, New York, NY

Near and Middle Eastern Studies Program of the Center for International Studies, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

Middle East Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

Program in Near Eastern Studies, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ

South West Asian and North African Program, State University of New York, Binghamton, NY

Center for Middle Eastern Studies, The University of Texas, Austin, TX

Middle East Center, The University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

Middle East Center, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

The Campaign Against Middle East Studies Centers

Middle East studies programs have grown rapidly on campuses across the United States in just over 25 years because of the area's growing strategic interest for the United States. A number of leading universities established programs or centers including Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Princeton, Michigan, University of California at Berkeley, UCLA, the Universities of Pennsylvania, Utah, Chicago, Arizona, Texas and Washington (Seattle). While the older departments (e.g., Princeton, Harvard) continued their emphasis on languages, ancient and medieval history and literature, the newer programs, which emerged under the National Defense Act of 1958, offered degrees in the modern Middle East. Immediately, new issues began to arise focusing on various aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict as they related to the curriculum, the literature and the teachers themselves. Because the newer departments were more interdisciplinary, contemporary and concerned with policy-oriented subjects, they became the object of controversy. Zionist organizations began to commission studies and prepare surveys of Near East Studies departments to determine if their programs could ultimately leave a detrimental imprint on the nature and conduct of United States foreign policy in the Middle East.

Since many of these centers were federally-funded, Zionist groups carefully looked for possible assistance in the law. And because many academic departments, in an atmosphere of diminished federal funding, were scrambling for funds, major Zionist organizations placed these centers under the microscope to determine whether Arab funds were being sought and received. Financial support from Arab states or individuals was often treated as a prima facie case of subvention, hence a 1982 study by the Institute of Jewish Affairs (in association with the World Jewish Congress) under the title "Arab Dollars and American Universities." [1]

Another study, "Middle East Centers At Selected American Universities," by Gary Schiff was commissioned by the American Jewish Committee. [2]

In May 1984, Theodore Mann, president of the American Jewish Congress,

announced an extensive campaign to get state legislatures to enact legislation compelling universities to disclose large gifts from foreign sources. [3] A February 24, 1984 article in the Jewish Press noted that the Maryland House of Delegates, following the lead of Illinois, "is now considering legislation to compel colleges and universities to disclose the source of sizable foreign grants and gifts as a means of thwarting a major Arab propaganda effort on American campuses. (Emphasis added) The article quoted Will Maslow, AJC's general counsel, as saying bills like this would effectively blunt Arab attempts to influence teaching and research which are"endangering academic freedom and distorting the educational process."

Among those attacked in the Maslow Report is Georgetown University's Center for Contemporary Arab Affairs (CCAS), some of whose faculty are labeled "pro PLO." The Report details grants provided by the Arab world and dozens of recipients are mentioned. Of particular interest is a description of "guidelines" delivered by the American Jewish Congress in 1979 to American universities considering grant agreements with foreign governments. The most effective weapon against offensive grants, the "guidelines" advised, was to publicize them among the faculty, who in turn would mobilize to do the rest. The Report contrasted the success of this approach at the Middle East Center at the University of Southern California and at Concordia University in Canada with the silence of the Georgetown faculty. [4]

That external pressure on Middle East studies departments and individual faculty members continues unabated is shown in the campaign against the University of Arizona's Middle East Outreach Program, inaugurated in 1975 under the University's Oriental Studies Department.

In 1977, Dr. Sheila Scoville became head of the program, which functioned without incident until early 1981. The Middle East Outreach Center's articles of incorporation caught the attention of law professor Boris Kozolchyk, who apparently alerted the Tucson Jewish Community Council (TJCC), which attacked the Outreach program in February 1981. The TJCC alleged that the program's teaching materials included "Arab propaganda." Pressure was brought against the university as well as Arizona political leaders and public officials.

In October 1981, the new head of the Oriental Studies Department, Professor Gimello, along with University President Shafer and Near East Studies Director Ludwig Adamec, met with TJCC representatives. Dr. Scoville was excluded from the meeting on grounds she was a staff worker and not faculty. The TJCC was asked to document its charges, and an ad hoc faculty committee was appointed to consider them. [5]

In March 1982, the TJCC submitted its own 120-page report, prepared by a committee of four with no area expertise. The report, which characterized any scholarly criticism of Israeli policies as "Arab propaganda," was seen by faculty only, with precautions taken to prevent photocopying. Dr. Scoville, as non-faculty, was denied access to the report.

The university ad hoc committee, meeting in April to consider the TJCC report, ruled that the Near East Studies library, which contained the outreach program's materials, should be closed until the conflict was resolved. In September 1982, the library reopened at the insistence of the Near East Studies director.

When the ad hoc committee issued its final report, it was rejected by the TJCC. A second panel, this one including Middle East faculty, was appointed. Their "Extended Report" was released in December 1982.

At the turn of the year, the University's new president, Koffler, announced the creation of a third panel, including specialists from Princeton, Harvard, Berkeley and Boston University. The panel found no basis for the charges made by the TJCC; it concluded:

> To insist . . . that the case can be closed only after the university takes action in line with the TJCC demands, is to cross a clearly demarcated line . . . it is to go beyond the legitimate right to question and be informed, moving into the illegitimate demand to control and to censor. 6

The TJCC characterized the arbitration panel's findings as "seriously flawed," and continued its public pressure and political offensive during the spring. They invited speakers such as Joseph Churba into town and conducted their own media campaign.

In May 1983, the Superintendent of the Tucson School District announced the suspension and revocation of credit and salary increment credit for high school teachers who had taken courses from Dr. Scoville's Middle East Outreach workshops. While the superintendent tried to revoke credit retroactively, the school board overrode him and let past credit stand. However, the school board did rule that the center's material could not be used in class without special permission from the high school principal.

During the summer of 1983, the TJCC announced it would broaden its efforts by challenging the entire range of the center's functions. University President Koffler, himself a TJCC member, pursued the initiative by announcing his plan to appoint another panel to investigate the center's funding sources. TJCC's agenda at this time included barring any contributions from Arab

governments or from United States corporations doing business in the Middle East. They also announced they would not be bound by the arbitration panel's findings.

[As of this writing, Sheila Scoville remains at the University of Arizona, and with the Outreach Center. The Tucson School District refuses to grant either academic credit or salary increment credit for any course taught by Dr. Scoville.]

Another censorship case involves Prof. Elizabeth Femea of the University of Texas. Professor Femea produced a film about Palestinian women under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). "Women Under Siege" depicts the lives of six women in South Lebanon's Rashidiyeh refugee camp. When Nathan Perlmutter of ADL described the film as "unabashed propaganda for the PLO," NEH in June 1983 denounced its own support of the film, and John Agresto, assistant NEH chairman, called the film "politically tendentious."

1. Will Maslow, "Arab Dollars And American Universities," Research Report no. 2 (London: Institute of Jewish Affairs in Association with the World Jewish Congress, September 1982).

2. Gary S. Schiff, "Middle East Centers At Selected American Universities" (report presented to the American Jewish Committee by the Academy for Educational Development, mimeographedscheduled for publication, September 16, 1981).

3. "Anti-Propaganda Urged," Jewish Exponent, May 25, 1984. Mann announced that a "nationwide effort to get state legislatures to enact laws compelling colleges and universities to disclose large gifts from foreign sources has been announced …" The American Jewish Congress drafted a model bill which requires disclosures from universities and colleges within 120 days from receiving grants. States considering such legislation are California, Florida, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

4. A proposed Middle East Studies center at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles was scrapped by the Board of Trustees after opposition from the faculty. Allegations were made that funding for the center was going to be raised from United States corporations doing business in Saudi Arabia. See Judith Miller, "Critics Question Builder's Drive for U.S. Center Sought By Saudis," New York Times, August 28, 1979.

With regard to Concordia University in Canada, a campaign by faculty succeeded in opposing an exchange agreement with King Faisal University of Saudi Arabia.

5. See: Kevin Dayton, “Charges Of Bias In UA Classes Called Groundless,” Tucson Citizen, September 20, 1983; “Panel Finds ‘No Systematic Pattern Of Bias’ At UA Near Eastern Center,” Arizona Daily Star, September 23, 1983. See letter by Dr. Ludwig W. Adamec, director of Near Eastern Center at AU, in Arizona Daily Star, September 25, 1983.

6. “The Question of Bias,” Arizona Daily Star, September 25, 1983.

Implications Of The Campaign

Our study has shown that major Jewish organizations and pro-Israel individuals are striving to silence criticism of Israeli policies on the American campus, basing their efforts on the premise that such criticism could spell disaster for the United States-Israeli special relationship. Labeling criticism and analysis, considered normal and acceptable in open and democratic societies, as expressions of antiSemitism is nothing more than a thinly-veiled attempt to hide the defamatory nature and anti-civil libertarian character of the campaign.

The fallacy of the premise that the Zionist campus strategy is part and parcel of the endeavor against racist anti-Semitism is also apparent in that strategy's utilization of those very tactics which characterize the work of the anti-Semite himself. Our study has shown that the use of derisive labels such as "pro-PLO" is clearly intended to delegitimize criticism, to destroy the reputation of dissidents, and ultimately to prevent the airing of all views on the subject.

Inevitably categorizations such as "pro-PLO," "anti-Jewish" and "anti-Israel" set groups and individuals apart and against each other in a manner which might destroy cooperative efforts on other issues. The socialization process inherent in this campaign has a chilling effect on inter-group cooperation and tolerance, so essential to a pluralist existence.

Ironically, the organizations which still pride themselves on combating defamation and ethnic prejudice have now become a major source of defamation. The ADL, established to combat anti-Jewish prejudice and which kept ultrarightist groups under surveillance in the 1950's and 1960's, now seems to be leading the Jewish establishment in attacking the monitoring activities of groups and individuals-largely in the center and on the left-whose opposition to Israel appears based on that country's policies in the Middle East, South Africa, Central America and elsewhere, and is largely free of antipathy to Jewish values.

Most disturbing, however, are the implications of the case studies described in this article. Left unanswered is the extent to which they are being duplicated on campuses across the continent.

The tragedy today is that blacklisting activities and surveillance are being transplanted to the American college campus, traditionally a bastion of free and open debate. The potential impact on the concept of academic freedom on the campus, and on civil society, will surely be significant.